

June 17, 1987

TO: File

FROM: Tom Munson, Reclamation Hydrologist *TM*

RE: Tract 1 Mid-Permit Term Stipulation Response Review,
Genwal Coal Company, Crandall Canyon Mine,
ACT/015/032, Folder #2 and #3, Carbon County, Utah

Summary

On February 27, 1987, Dave Cline compiled a technical memo stating that the material received by the Division on July 11, 1986 from Genwal Coal Company had been reviewed and that diversion RD-4 had not been designed the same way in Appendix 7-7, pages 27o and 27s as shown on Plate 3-5. Based on the response received by the Division on May 8, 1987, addressing the concerns spelled out in Dave Cline's technical memo of February 7, 1987, the Division still needs the following information.

Body

After reviewing the calculations in Appendix 7-7 and looking at the cross-section of RD-4 found on page 27o, I feel that the following information is still lacking and needs to be addressed before final technical review:

At the point where Section 3 enters Section 4 of diversion RD-4, a 15-foot long section of riprapped channel with a d₅₀ of 12 inches is recommended by the applicant. I would like to see calculations or documentation demonstrating the adequacy of this method of treatment as opposed to using an energy dissipating catch basin or similar structure at this point. The second place in the

Page 2
Memo to File
ACT/015/032
June 17, 1987

proposed plan lacking information is the point at which Section 4 of RD-4 enters diversion RD-5. Since RD-4 enters diversion RD-5 at a right angle, the applicant must show how this will be accomplished without overtopping RD-5 during peak flows, and also what protection will be provided for erosion control as RD-4 enters RD-5 and is forced to make a right angle turn.

Recommendations

The operator should be notified that this information is still lacking, and the technical analysis of diversion RD-4 cannot proceed without this information.

djh
cc: S. Linner
J. Leatherwood
9486R/27